



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,905	04/21/2004	Richard Kunkel	42526-2800	5656
21611	7590	05/08/2006	EXAMINER	
SNELL & WILMER LLP 600 ANTON BOULEVARD SUITE 1400 COSTA MESA, CA 92626			FETSUGA, ROBERT M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3751	

DATE MAILED: 05/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/828,905

Applicant(s)

KUNKEL, RICHARD

Examiner

Robert M. Fetsuga

Art Unit

3751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 April 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07/23/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3751

1. The drawings are objected to because reference numeral "34" (par. 0015 ln. 1) is missing, reference numeral "39" designates different elements in Figs. 2 and 3, in Fig. 3 reference numeral "45" apparently should be --30-- (par. 0016 ln. 4) and reference numeral "40" (par. 0017 ln. 1) is missing, and in Fig. 5 material cross-hatching is inaccurate and reference numeral "36" (par. 0019 ln. 3) is missing.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "light source" set forth in claim 2 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be

Art Unit: 3751

labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Paragraph 0020, line 6, "47" apparently should be --49--; and reference numeral "59" (Fig. 7) lacks a detailed description.

Appropriate correction is required.

3. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Proper antecedent basis for the "formed into the top rim" subject matter set forth in claim 1, "chamber" set forth in claim 5, and the subject matter set forth in claim 6 could not be found in the specification. Applicant is reminded claim terminology in mechanical cases should appear in the descriptive portion of the specification by reference to the drawing(s).

4. Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point

Art Unit: 3751

out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is unclear as to whether the "spa" is intended to be part of the claimed combination since structure of the "waterfall" is defined as being connected thereto (ln. 4), but no positive structural antecedent basis therefor has been defined.

Claim 7 is unclear as to whether the "water" and "spa" are intended to be part of the claimed combination since structure of the "waterfall" is defined as being connected thereto, but no positive structural antecedent basis therefor has been defined.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 3751

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koren.

The Koren reference (Fig. 2) discloses a waterfall comprising: a channel 16 including a floor 56 and walls 50,51; an access aperture 18; a light source 12; and a chamber 34, as claimed.

7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koren and Lowry et al.

Although the channel of the Koren waterfall does not include a rib, as claimed, attention is directed to the Lowry et al. (Lowry) reference which discloses an analogous waterfall 16 which further includes a channel 63 having a rib 64. Therefore, in consideration of Lowry, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the waterfall art to associate a rib with the Koren channel in order to facilitate water flow.

8. Claims 4, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koren and Lowry as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Gaffney et al.

Re claim 4, although the channel of the Koren waterfall does not include a disruptor button, as claimed, attention is directed to the Gaffney et al. (Gaffney) reference which discloses an analogous waterfall which further includes a channel 47 having a disruptor button 59. Therefore, in consideration of Gaffney, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the waterfall art to associate a disruptor button with the Koren channel in order to facilitate water flow.

Re claim 6, although the parts of the Koren waterfall are not plastic, as claimed, attention is again directed to Gaffney which discloses plastic parts (col. 2 lns. 48-50). Therefore, in further consideration of Gaffney, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the waterfall art to associate plastic with the Koren parts in order to facilitate molding.

9. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koren, Lowry and Gaffney as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of McDonald et al.

Although the light source of the Koren waterfall does not include a lens, as claimed, attention is directed to the McDonald et al. (McDonald) reference which discloses an

Art Unit: 3751

analogous waterfall which further includes a light source 27 having a lens 33. Therefore, in consideration of McDonald, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the waterfall art to associate a lens with the Koren light source in order to facilitate light dispersal.

10. Applicant is referred to MPEP 714.02 and 608.01(o) in responding to this Office action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert M. Fetsuga at telephone number 571/272-4886 who can be most easily reached Monday through Thursday. The Office central fax number is 571/273-8300.



Robert M. Fetsuga
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3751